

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 10, 2005 LB 217

just think that is wrong. We have...the NRDs across this state have done a tremendous thing. I'll tell you, you look at Iowa and you look at the Nishnabotna River that floods every year over there, that would not happen here in Nebraska because we have NRDs. It's probably one of the greatest things that was structured within this state. But I don't see any reason whatsoever to segregate this out, and if this amendment passes, AM0744, I will not support the bill. I certainly will not support this amendment. But I think that is a wrong way to go and would urge my colleagues to think about this issue before you would pass on AM0744. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Jensen. Senator Brown, followed by Senator Mines and others.

SENATOR BROWN: Mr. President, members, I serve on the Government Committee, was a part of the underlying philosophy of excluding NRDs, and it was not because I do not trust NRDs. It was not because I have any problem with some of the activities that the Papio NRD has undertaken. I do not support AM0744 because I think the decision was made not negatively towards NRDs, but rather looking at the nature of what we wanted to accomplish with LB 217, looking at the nature of the entities that we were encouraging. That the...what we were encouraging were entities that traditionally bond for activities and allowing them, in a special sense, to have a special way of bonding. And I think that there is a difference with what we're trying to encourage. I support LB 217. I support the ideas that are included and I think that we are getting a little outside what we were trying to accomplish with LB 217 with the inclusion of NRDs and with the whole discussion that we're having this morning. Now, there very well may be issues that need to be addressed by the Natural Resources Committee about the authority of NRDs to be able to bond and things like that, but I don't know that it should be...that those kinds of decisions should be decided on LB 217, which was meant to be an opening of the door, but a fairly narrow opening of the door as to what individual entities could do together to accomplish efficiencies. When we find out about that and when possibly the Natural Resources Committee comes to more conclusions about the authorities...the authority of NRDs to do things like bonding,